

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated July 1, 2005 are respectfully requested. An Information Disclosure Statement and Terminal Disclaimer are submitted with this amendment along with the fees due.

I. Amendments

Claims 1, 5, 7-11, 15-19, 21, and 22 are amended for proper language and grammar.

No new matter is added by way of these amendments.

II. Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to as allegedly informal. Formal drawings were required "if formal drawings have not been submitted" (Item 2 of Office action mailed July 1, 2005). Applicants note formal drawings were submitted on November 17, 2003. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

III. Objections to the Claims

Claims 1 and 16 were objected to for alleged informalities. Specifically, the claims were objected to for the "and" as well as the period after the word "term" in claims 1, 16, and 22. Applicants have amended the claims in accord with the Examiner's kind suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the language "that." Applicants have amended the claims to recite "the" or "an" as

appropriate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

V. Obvious-type double patenting rejections

Claims 1-22 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-26 of co-pending Application No. 10/374,877 filed February 25, 2003.

Claims 1-22 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-25 of Application No. 10/438,486 filed May 15, 2003.

A Terminal Disclaimer prepared in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(b) and (c) is enclosed. The signed Terminal Disclaimer obviates these obviousness-type double patenting rejections.


VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of pending claims 1-22 is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4401.

Date: August 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,


Peter J. Dehlinger
Registration No. 28,006

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918